

-12-

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on February 3, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this Application, Applicants submit the following amendments as well as remarks discussing patentability of rejected and newly added claims.

Claims 1-58 were previously pending in the subject Application. Claims 59-61 are being added by way of this amendment. Please cancel claims 29-31, 33-35, 38, and 50-52 without prejudice to filing same in a continuation application. Thus, after entry of this Amendment, claims 1-28, 32, 36, 37, 39-49, 53-61 will be pending. No new matter was added to the application when adding the new claims. Support for the new claims can be found at pages 13-15 of the specification.

The following remarks address the rejections of claims 1-58 as set out in the present Office Action as well as patentability of newly added claims 59-61. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Rejection of Claims 1-24 and 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Applicants have cancelled claims 29-31 and have amended claim 1 to include certain patentable limitations found in these cancelled claims. For example, claim 1 now recites "a website for receiving the event data from the transmitter and making the event data accessible for viewing by at least one authorized entity, the website generating a web page viewed by a central monitor that makes an initial determination whether action is required and, if a determination is made by the central monitor that action is required, the central monitor notifies at least one other authorized entity to access the web page."

The Examiner rejected previously pending claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Segupta (U.S. Patent 6,359,647) in view of

Fowler (U.S. Patent 6,714,977). The Office Action likens elements in these references to those in claim 31 to reject the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and provide an analysis of how the claim differs over and is not obvious in view of the cited art.

To reject the claimed invention, the office action relies teachings of Sengupta and Fowler. Applicants note that the office action relies on Fowler for a teaching of the invention rather than the Sengupta reference itself. Therefore, the Sengupta reference itself does not suggest the claimed invention and the Examiner relies on the teachings in Fowler at column 8, lines 34-67 and Fowler at column 7 lines 45-58 which read as follows:

“FIG. 6 illustrates another embodiment of the computer network and equipment monitoring method and system of the present invention. Net bot 40 of FIG. 6 can have SNMP, DMI and NT access for internal server monitoring. Like enterprise-class network monitors, net bot 40 can periodically check for SNMP traps, Windows NT traps, and BIOS alerts, and can notify the system administrator of their occurrence. Common functions of net bot 40 can include checking the on/off status of both CPU fans and other system fans, CPU temperature checking, and checking of the conditions of various disk drives. Net bot 40 can support various protocols, including SNMP (simple network message protocol). Net bot 40 can launch software agents that can determine the operating condition of system routers, bridges, uninterruptable power supplies, etc. If the agents find a stuck disk, for example, on a server, they will log it as a fault. When a fault is detected, agents of net bot 40 can return that condition to net bot 40 in java language, and net bot 40 can generate an email message reporting the malfunction. Net bot 40 can be configured to maintain an email list of all personnel the system administrator wants net bot 40 to notify. Net bot 40 can also be configured to, after waiting a certain amount of time following email notification, page the system administrator or other personnel.

Beyond receiving notification via email of a fault, a system administrator, or other user, can obtain real-time reports of environmental conditions and equipment conditions in a server room via an internet connection to net bot 40. Additionally, if, like video climate bot 34, the embodiment of the present invention being used by a system administrator provides video, a current video image of the monitored server room 10 can also be viewed via the internet. A system administrator can configure net bot 40, climate bot 30, or video climate bot 34 to provide only the information the system administrator is interested in receiving. In this way, the interface of the embodiments of this invention can be kept as simple or as complex as a system administrator requires. Any of the embodiments of the present invention can be upgraded via software that can be downloaded from the internet.”

“In one embodiment of the present invention, video climate bot 34 can be set to receive an input signal from sensor 38 indicating that door 36 has been opened. Video climate bot 36 can be configured to wait a pre-set amount of time (for example, one second) following the opening of door 36 and take a video image of server room 10. The video image can be transmitted to a system administrator to indicate the presence of an external influence, such as a person, entering server room 10. Video climate bot 34 can thus be used as an additional security measure and record-keeping device to track personnel access into server room 10. Video climate bot 34 and sensor 38 can also be used to indicate the presence of other external influences beyond personnel access to server room 10.” (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited passages in Fowler also do not teach or suggest the claimed invention. For example, based on this cited passage, the Examiner states that “Fowler discloses notifying the system administrator by email of environmental conditions and equipment conditions.”

-15-

Additionally, the Examiner states that the system in Fowler "also can be used for security purposes."

Applicants submit that the claimed invention operates in a different manner than as disclosed by Fowler. For example, the Examiner likens the central monitor to the system administrator in Fowler (see the rejection of claim 29). However, note that the cited passages do not disclose that the system administrator notifies another party such as an authorized entity to view the website. Accordingly, the claimed invention includes limitations not taught or suggested by the cited references.

If the Examiner is to maintain the rejection based on the cited prior art, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner point out with particularity where any prior art reference teaches or suggests "a web page viewed by a central monitor" and, if deemed necessary by the central monitor, the central monitor notifying "at least one other authorized entity to access the web page." As discussed above, the Examiner cites passages in Fowler that only disclose notifying a system administrator or user of an event, not that a central monitor viewing the web page notifies another entity to view the web page as in the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentably distinct and advantageous over the cited prior art, and the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested. Pending claims 2-24, and 32 depend from claim 1 and therefore also should be allowable.

Note that claim 32 further distinguishes the claimed invention over the cited prior art. For example, claim 32 recites "wherein the central monitor and the at least one other authorized entity communicate during viewing of the event data." In addition to the differences cited above, neither of the cited references

-16-

discloses that the central monitor (viewing the web page) communicates with another entity also viewing the web page.

The Examiner reasons that "Websites are accessed over the Internet and are therefore accessed by more than one entity." Applicants disagree with this assessment. For example, although some websites can be accessed by anyone, the website associated with security applications as in the cited references normally would not be accessible by anyone. Therefore, merely placing sensitive material such as event data on a website does not ensure that two or more people can view the same material at the same time. Note that claim 32 recites that at least one authorized entity accesses the website, not just any person browsing the Internet. Thus, the Examiner has not provided any indication that it would be normal practice to make images associated with a detected event available on a website, especially one in which authorized entities communicate with each other during viewing of the event on a website. Applicants respectfully request allowance of claim 32.

Note that claim 36 should be allowable for similar reasons as claim 32 and that the Examiner has not provided a proper basis for the rejection for similar reasons as above.

Rejection of Claims 37-47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Applicants have cancelled claim 38 and have amended claim 37 to include the limitations of previously pending claim 38. For example, claim 37 now recites both "a switch coupled to the controller and actuated by a user witnessing the image on the at least one display device causing the controller to transmit the image to ; and a website that receives ~~for receiving~~ the image and makes ~~making~~ the image accessible by at least one authorized entity on a web page, wherein at least two authorized entities access the web page simultaneously."

The Examiner rejected previously pending claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Segupta (U.S. Patent 6,359,647) in view of Fowler (U.S. Patent 6,714,977). The Office Action likens elements in these references to those in now amended claim 37 to reject the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and provide an analysis of how the claim differs over and is not obvious in view of the cited art.

To reject previously pending claim 38, the Examiner relies on general knowledge known in the art in which multiple users access a common website as well as column 10, lines 25-32 of Sengupta.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention includes a novel configuration over the cited prior art. For example, claim 37 recites that a user viewing an image in the display screen actuates a switch to control transmission of the image for display in a website accessible by at least two authorized users.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that even the combination of Sengupta and Fowler does not teach or suggest the claimed invention and the combination of limitation. For example, Sengupta does not recite that a user witnessing the image controls transmission of the image to a website for simultaneous viewing by multiple authorized entities. Instead, Sengupta enables a user to see what he wishes to see on a screen, not what images will be transmitted for viewing on a website. Fowler also does not enable a user viewing the images to control transmission of the selected images for viewing on a website. For example, as discussed, the robot resource in Fowler notifies a system administrator of the occurrence of an event for viewing by the system administrator of the images on a web page. However, just as in Sengupta, note there is also no indication in Fowler that a user viewing the images controls a transmission of the images to a web page. Thus, even the combination of references does not teach or suggest every claim limitation.

Applicants submit that the claimed invention operates in a different manner than as disclosed by a combination of Sengupta and Fowler. Thus, if the Examiner is to maintain the rejection based on the cited prior art, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner point out with particularity where any prior art reference teaches or suggests that a user witnessing an image on a display further initiates transmission of the image to a website.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 37 is patentably distinct and advantageous over the cited prior art, and the rejection of claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Allowance of claim 37 is respectfully requested. Pending claims 39-47 depend from claim 37 and therefore also should be allowable.

Rejection of Claims 48-49 and 53-56 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Applicants have cancelled claims 50-52 and have amended claim 48 to include certain patentable limitations found in these cancelled claims. For example, claim 1 now recites "notifying a central monitor that an event has occurred, the central monitor accessing and viewing the temporary web page to determine whether a course of action is required, wherein the central monitor notifies at least one other authorized entity to access the temporary web page and communicate with the central monitor to jointly evaluate the event content".

The Examiner rejected previously pending claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Segupta (U.S. Patent 6,359,647) in view of Fowler (U.S. Patent 6,714,977). The Office Action likens elements in these references to those in claim 1 to reject the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and provide an analysis of how the claim differs over and is not obvious in view of the cited art.

To reject the claimed invention, the office action relies on teachings of Sengupta and Fowler. Applicants submit that claim 48 includes similar distinguishing limitations as previously discussed for claim 1 above and should be allowable for similar reasons. For example, neither cited reference suggests that a central monitor that accesses the web page further notify an authorized user to access the web page to jointly evaluate event content.

If the Examiner is to maintain the rejection based on the cited prior art, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner point out with particularity where any prior art reference teaches or suggests inclusion of a central monitor that views the web page to determine whether a course of action is required and, if so, notifying an authorized entity to view the web page to jointly evaluate the content. As discussed above, the Examiner cites passages in Fowler that only disclose notifying a system administrator or user of an event, not that a central monitor viewing the web page notifies another entity to view the web page as in the claimed invention, especially one in which the central monitor and the authorize entity jointly evaluate the content. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 48 is patentably distinct and advantageous over the cited prior art, and the rejection of claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Allowance of claim 48 is respectfully requested. Pending claims 49 and 53-56 depend from claim 48 and therefore also should be allowable.

Rejection of Claims 57-58 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Applicants have amended claim 57 to include patentable limitations as discussed above for claim 37. For example, claim 57 now recites that a user viewing and controlling an image on a display initiates transmission of the image to a website for display on a respective web page. Neither of the cited references discloses this claim limitation.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 57 is patentably distinct and advantageous over the cited prior art, and the rejection of claim 57 under 35


-20-

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims as well as newly added claims are in condition for allowance. A Notice to this affect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after reviewing this Response, that the pending claims are not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the Representative.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0901.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul P. Kriz, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 45,752
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C.
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 366-9600
Facsimile: (508) 616-9805
Customer No.: 022468

Attorney Docket No.: RDA03-03

Dated: May 3, 2005